



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,114	03/19/2004	Neil G. Jacobson	X-1551 US	8496
24309 7590 10/03/2008				
XILINX, INC				
ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT				
2100 LOGIC DR				
SAN JOSE, CA 95124				
EXAMINER				
PEYTON, TAMMARA R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2182				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/805,114

Applicant(s)

JACOBSON ET AL.

Examiner

TAMMARA R. PEYTON

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 25, 26, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-24, 27 and 30 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/12/08
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 25, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geer et al., (US 5,079,725), cited as IDS 8/12/08 and Nishihara et al., (US 6,336,209)

As per claim 1-4, 25, and 28, Geer teaches an arrangement for managing configuration data for a system, comprising: a software tool hosted on a data processing arrangement; a system interface coupled to the tool and to the system; and

wherein the tool is configured to, generate a chain description data set (a boundary scan device chain) that specifies an order (Geer teaches discloses the use of wherein the plurality of devices are arranged and coupled in a scan chain description data set, and the function used for generating a system ID value that is further a function of respective positions of the plurality of devices in a scan chain description data set) in a configuration chain of configurable devices (plurality of devices) in the system and obviously identifies configuration data sets associated with the configurable devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Geer teaches wherein the plurality of SRLs are arranged and coupled in a scan chain (col. 5, lines 29-35, fig. 1, SRLs 14 and 16) and will retrieve the ID number that is

equivalent to generating the system ID. Specifically, Geer teaches wherein the function of retrieving the ID number is a function of the locations of the SRLs in the scan chain, specifically "the chip ID or level ID SRLs indicating the location of the SRLs to retrieve the stored identification number." The location of the SRLs is equivalent to the positions of the plurality of devices in a scan chain

As per claim 5, 26, and 29, Geer does not expressing teach wherein extracting from the archive the configuration data sets, chain description data set, and system identifier value in response to a user control; determining a target system identifier value of a target system; comparing the target system identifier value to the system identifier value extracted from the archive; and if the target system identifier value does not match the system identifier value extracted from the archive, preventing configuration of the target system with the extracted configuration data sets. However, Nishihara teaches reading device specifications from the connected circuit information from a memory archive unit (200, Fig. 1) using the device ID codes (col. 5, lines 46-col. 16, lines 1-67) to associate the device and the device specification. Further, Nishihara includes an editing part that generates to an archive including the configuration data sets and device ID codes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the system method of Geer by implementing reading values and keeping track of an ID code from each of a plurality of devices on the system, disclosed by Nishihara because it would provide Geer's system method with the enhanced capability of identifying devices connected to the system bus. (Nishihara, Abstract, col. 5, lines 46-col. 16, lines 1-67).

Claims 6-24, 27, and 30, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, specifically claim 6, 27, and 30, states “ if the target system identifier value matches the system identifier value read from the archive, generating a configuration bitstream from the extracted configuration data sets identified by, and in the order specified in, the chain description data set; and configuring the target system with the configuration bitstream.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammara Peyton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4157. The examiner can normally be reached between 6:30 - 4:00 from Monday to Thursday, (I am off every first Friday), and 6:30-3:00 every second Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

/Tammara R Peyton/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2182

September 27, 2008